



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,915	10/28/2003	Kwang-Deok Seo	P-0569	3949

34610 7590 12/19/2005

FLESHNER & KIM, LLP
P.O. BOX 221200
CHANTILLY, VA 20153

EXAMINER

CHAN, WING F

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2643

DATE MAILED: 12/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/693,915

Applicant(s)

SEO, KWANG-DEOK

Examiner

Wing F. Chan

Art Unit

2643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 11-15 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 16-19, 22-24, 26-33 and 36-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 20, 21, 25, 34 and 35 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 2643

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 3, 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 8-10 are vague and indefinite in that claim 8 depended from claim 9; and claim 9 depended from claim 8.

As to claim 3, line 1 "the MCU" lacks antecedent basis.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 26, 32, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takashima et al (US PG PUB. NO. 2001/0047300 hereinafter Takashima).

Takashima discloses a digital video signal processing system implemented for a mobile communication system comprising a plurality of mobile conference terminals (e.g. 131, 132) and a multipoint controller (8). For example, see Figs. 1-5, [0072-0075].

5. Claims 1, 26, 32, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Kobayashi et al (JP 2003-US PGPUB. NO. 2001/0047300 hereinafter Kobayashi).

Kobayashi discloses a digital video signal processing system implemented for a mobile communication system comprising a plurality of mobile conference terminals and a multipoint controller. For example, see Figs. 25-30, [0072-0080].

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2643

8. Claims 2, 6, 16, 27, 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi or Takashima in view of Nakatani et al (JP 63-276938 hereinafter Nakatani).

As to claims 2, 6, 16, 27, 36, it is old and well known in the art to provide a scaler for reducing the resolution of video signal for transmission to a remote device, for example see Nakatani's abstract. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kobayashi or Takashima to comprise a scaler in order to transmit reduced resolution video signal to a remote low resolution mobile phone for viewing.

9. Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi or Takashima in view of Fandrianto et al (US PAT. NO. 6,441,842 hereinafter Fandrianto) and Park et al (US PG PUB. NO. 2003/0223498 hereinafter Park).

Kobayashi or Takashima differs from the claimed invention in not disclosing processing the video signals using macroblock address. However, it is old and well known in the art that the basic video information processing unit is a macroblock, for example see Fandrianto col. 9 lines 39-58. Park teaches a video encoding method and encoder for improving performance and reducing power consumption by processing video information for a slice of a current frame, where the slice comprises plurality of macroblocks, and processing the slice by consecutively (addressing) encoding and decoding each macroblock; for example see [0021-0024,0042-0100]. Thus, it would

Art Unit: 2643

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kobayashi or Takashima to comprise means for processing the video signals at the macroblock level to improve performance and reduce power consumption.

10. Claims 7, 17, 18, 22, 23, 28-30, 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi or Takashima as modified by Nakatani as applied to claims 2, 6 above, and further in view of Sano et al (US PG PUB. NO. 2003,0169935 hereinafter Sano).

it is old and well known for image compression apparatus and method to convert RGB color into $YCbCr$ such that the compression is performed independently for every component, for example see Sano [0045,0046]. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kobayashi or Takashima as modified by Nakatani to comprise a converter means for converting the RGB color into $YCbCr$ such that the compression is performed independently for every component.

11. Claims 19, 24, 31, 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi or Takashima as modified by Nakatani and Sano as applied to claims 17, 18 above, and further in view of Alvarez (US PG PUB. NO. 2003/0194013).

As to claims 19, 24, 31, 40, it is old and well known to use MPEG-4 for compressing video images, for example see Alvarez [0002]. Thus, it would have been expedient obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to modify Kobayashi or Takashima as modified by Nakatani and Sano to use MPEG-4 compression since it is an industrial standard well known for compressing video images for transmission.

12. Claims 11-15 are allowed.

13. Claims 20, 21, 25, 34, 35 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wing F. Chan whose telephone number is 571-272-7493. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9 AM to 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz can be reached on 571-272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 2643

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Wing F. Chan". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Wing" and last name "Chan" being clearly legible.

Wing F. Chan
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2643

12/9/05